

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

WILLIAM A. CRUMP, JR.,

Petitioner,

Case Number: 2:16-CV-13381

HONORABLE DENISE PAGE HOOD

v.

S.L. BURT,

Respondent.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S MOTION  
FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL (ECF NO. 10)**

Petitioner William A. Crump, Jr., has filed a *pro se* petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254, challenging his convictions for three counts of third-degree criminal sexual conduct, three counts of fourth-degree criminal sexual conduct, and one count of accosting a child for an immoral purpose. Now before the Court is Petitioner's Motion for Appointment of Counsel.

Petitioner has no absolute right to be represented by counsel on federal habeas corpus review. *See Abdur-Rahman v. Michigan Dept. of Corrections*, 65 F.3d 489, 492 (6th Cir. 1995); *see also Wright v. West*, 505 U.S. 277, 293 (1992) (citing *Pennsylvania v. Finley*, 481 U.S. 551, 555 (1987)). “[A]ppointment of counsel in a civil case is . . . a matter within the discretion of the court. It is a

privilege and not a right.”” *Childs v. Pellegrin*, 822 F.2d 1382, 1384 (6th Cir. 1987). A habeas petitioner may obtain representation at any stage of the case “[w]henver the United States magistrate or the court determines that the interests of justice so require.” 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B). The Court determines that the interests of justice do not require appointment of counsel.

Accordingly, the Court DENIES Petitioner’s Motion for Appointment of Counsel (ECF No. 10).

SO ORDERED.

S/Denise Page Hood

Denise Page Hood

Chief Judge, United States District Court

Dated: October 10, 2017

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record on October 10, 2017, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

S/LaShawn R. Saulsberry

Case Manager